


0039-7544-2TTCRD



Handwritten notes: "HLP", "DELETED", and "11-18-03".

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
Toshimitsu KANEKO et al : GROUP ART UNIT: 2621
SERIAL NO: 09/493,013 : EXAMINER: H. Akhavannik
FILED: January 28, 2000 :
FOR: OBJECT DETECTION METHOD
AND A VIDEO RETRIEVAL METHOD

PROVISIONAL ELECTION

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

APR 07 2003

Technology Center 2600

SIR:

Responsive to the Official Action dated March 14, 2003, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group II, Claims 9-14, drawn to video data description, classified in class 382, subclass 190 and reads on Figs. 10A, 10B and 10C for further examination on the merits in the present application. Applicants make this election based on the understanding that Applicants are not prejudiced against filing one or more divisional application that cover the non-elected claims.

The Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The outstanding Official Action identifies only two search classifications. It is believed that the claims of the present invention would have to be searched in only a small handful of

sub-classes, and would in any event appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Furthermore, since electronic searching is commonly performed, a search may be made of a large number of, or theoretically all, subclasses without substantial additional effort. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner, whereas it would be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain three separate applications.

Accordingly, on the basis that the burden on the Examiner would not be undue, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding restriction requirement and request examination on the merits of each of pending Claims 1-20.


Finally, the attention of the Patent Office is directed to the change of address of Applicants' representative, effective January 6, 2003:

Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, P.C.
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Please direct all future communication to this new address.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Eckhard H. Kuesters
Registration No: 28,870
Attorneys of Record



22850

Fax No.: (703) 413-2220

GJM:EHK:mh

I:\atty\EHK\Amend-Responses\0039\00397544-election.wpd